

REMARKS:

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, this application is deemed to be in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested.

Summary of Amendments to Claims

The Applicant has amended claim 6 to more clearly define the claimed invention, corrected the dependencies of claims 7-10 and canceled claim 11. No new matter has been added. Claims 6-10 remain pending in the application.

Response to Objections to the Specification

The Applicant has amended the Abstract to address the Examiner's objection thereto. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that the objection has been overcome and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

Submitted herewith is an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98, listing for Examiner's consideration EP 747 218, which was cited in the specification.

Response to Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 7-10 because the claims depend on cancelled claims 1, 3 and 4. The Applicant has corrected the dependencies of claims 7-10. Withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

Response to Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 4, 757,763 to MacPhee et al. (MacPhee). The Applicant has canceled claim 11. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is moot.

Response to Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacPhee in view of US 6,432,211 to Schmitt et al. (Schmitt).

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art references (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on an applicant's disclosure in the specification. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of MacPhee in view of Schmitt (whether or not they can be combined), fails to teach or suggest, either expressly or inherently, all the limitations of the claims.

The method of the present invention, as claimed in amended claim 6, comprises the steps of: (1) providing a blanket from a supply roll, the blanket being pre-treated with a solvent of high viscosity; (2) applying a cleaning medium for solving soil to the soiled surface; (3) placing the pre-treated blanket into operating contact with the soiled surface by a pressing means to create a soiled blanket; and (4) rolling up the soiled blanket to form a roll thereby removing the soiling from the soiled surface.

MacPhee teaches a method for cleaning the surface of a cylinder by treating a cleaning cloth with a solvent immediately before moving the cleaning cloth into contact with the surface of the cylinder to be cleaned. MacPhee does not teach the step of providing a blanket pre-treated with a solvent of high viscosity from a supply roll, nor does it teach the step of applying a cleaning medium to the soiled surface.

Schmitt teaches a method for cleaning the surface of cylinder by applying a cleaning medium directly to the surface of the rotating cylinder to be cleaned, instead of treating the cleaning cloth with a solvent, and then moving the dry cleaning cloth into contact with the surface to be cleaned. Schmitt does not teach the step of providing a blanket pre-treated with a solvent of high viscosity from a supply roll.

Neither MacPhee nor Schmitt provides any suggestion or motivation to combine the references. The two prior art references, even if combined, do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The pending claims recite the step of providing a blanket from a supply roll, the blanket being pre-treated with a solvent of high viscosity, which simplifies the cleaning procedure and the device required for the procedure. MacPhee does not teach or suggest this limitation, nor is this information taught or suggested by Schmitt. Modifying MacPhee in view of Schmitt, or vice versa, would not yield the Applicant's invention.

The method of the present invention eliminates the need for complex cleaning procedures and devices required in MacPhee's system. Furthermore, the present invention is very effective in removing heavy soiling from the surface of the cylinder to be cleaned. For heavy soiling on the cylinder surface that cannot be resolved and removed by the prior art systems and methods, a cleaning medium shall be applied, e.g. by a dampening unit, to the soiled surface, and the applied cleaning medium is then removed together with the soil taken up therein by the blanket that is pre-treated with a solvent of high viscosity.

Based on the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is unobvious over the applied prior art. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and accordingly, allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place the case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendment or correction be carried out by Examiner's Amendment and the case passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fees, including any

extension and/or excess claim fees, any additional fees, or credit any overpayment, to
Goodwin Procter LLP Deposit Account No. 06-0923.

Respectfully submitted for Applicant,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eva Tan", is written over a horizontal line.

Eva Tan (Reg. No. 46,406)
Goodwin Procter L.L.P.
103 Eisenhower Parkway
Roseland, NJ 07068
(973) 992-1990 Ext. 7904